Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

remarks of Russian spokesmen concerning the typical American house that is being shown in the trade fair in Moscow opening July 25.

The spokesmen have objected to the house on the professed—and also false—ground that the average American workingman can't afford it and therefore that it isn't representative.

Actually there is no doubt this exhibit is touching a sensitive spot in the Kremlin; namely, their housing picture as compared with our own; and they don't wish to see the differences demonstrated for internal consumption.

Although statistical and other data have been assembled and released by way of answer to the Russian charges, there is one item that seems to me to be especially conclusive and which I am enclosing for your information.

This is an on-the-spot approach to a typical American workingman in a typical home similar to our American exhibit, and facts and figures are cited to underscore the American case. I thought it might be helpful to you to have this material.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Administrator.

THE MAN RUSSIA SAYS ISN'T HERE—MEET THE TYPICAL U.S. WORKER WHO OWNS HIS OWN HOME

(By Ray Cromley)

BALTIMORE.—Though he doesn't have the money, Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator Norman Mason would like to take a truckdriver named Brantley Hart to Moscow.

Object: To make Nikita Khrushchev eat crow.

And Brantley Hart is the man to do just that.

You see, there's an American national exposition opening in Moscow this summer. And on the grounds is a model house—one that could sell for $13,500. It's to be advertised as a typical American worker's home.

But the Russians—the officials who have had a sneak preview—are pooh poohing the whole idea. Tass, the official Soviet news agency, which prints only thoughts authorized by Khrushchev and his aids, says the exhibition house is as typical of the typical American as the Taj Mahal is typical of Bombay textile workers or Buckingham Palace of British miners.

These statements aroused top U.S. Government Housing Man Mason. He asked his men to check the books and find just what homes typical American workers are buying. They came up with examples practically in Mason's own backyard.

Here's where truckdriver Brantley Hart comes in. He lives in one of these houses.

Brantley Hart, member of Teamster's Local 557, lives in a $13,500 house in Country Club Estates, just outside of Baltimore. He pays $86 in monthly payments out of his $123.40-a-week salary for a 5-room house that's a close equivalent of the American show house in the Moscow exhibition. The cost is roughly the same. So is the size—950 square feet. Also the general floor plan. Brantley Hart obviously is a typical American worker, with a wife, two children—and a new car in the carport.

Hart drives a truck on the midnight shift from Baltimore, 100 miles down the road to Salisbury, Md., and back every night, 40 hours a week.

Brantley Hart's case is typical. Country Club Estates is filled with American workmen. There's Clif Bowen, for example, a neon sign mechanic, member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 28. Clif earns $114 a week, pays $96 a month on a $13,500 house and lot with 1 tree, 10 bushes, and a sodded front lawn. He has two boys, one girl, and a wife.

Administrator Mason's statistic researchers found the average American workman these days buys, on the average, a $14,207 home and pays for it out of his $6,092 to $6,803 average salary, making average $96 monthly payments.

Why then do the Russians find this Moscow exhibit house hard to understand? The Federal Housing Administration has some figures on this, too.

It seems the average Russian city dweller—if he can afford a new house—ends up with two rooms and a bath, and shares it with another family.

In Moscow, a house like the Brantley Harts' would have 13 to 14 people living in it, instead of the 4 at the Harts' or the 5 at the Bowens'.

Some of Mason's men think this is why Nikita Khrushchev can't believe the American house in the Moscow exposition is typical.

They think this is why Tass and Russian officials jeer at the idea of a typical American workman coming home to a large television set, running water in the kitchen, wall-to-wall carpeting, radios and record players—the things most Americans take for granted.

Mr. JAVITS. It may be that the Soviet Union could convince its people that no such place as Country Club Estates could include an ordinary workingman as a resident. However, the fact is that Mr. Hart and his neighbors are on about the same income level. Mr. Hart pays $86 a month in payments on his home, out of a salary of $123.40 a week. He and his wife and two children occupy five rooms in a home which, judging from the picture, is a very pleasant place indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. If this home were in a Russian city it would be occupied by 13 or 14 persons of 2 or more families. So it is easy to see why the Soviet propaganda machine can say, with such effrontery, that the Harts do not exist. The fact is that the great disparity between the miserable living standards of their own people and those of the average American family is almost unbelievable. There has been a tremendous sacrifice of butter for guns in the Soviet Union.

This emphasizes the fact that the greatest engine working for the United States is the engine of truth. That is what I am endeavoring to bring to bear today on the allegations of the Soviets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FAIR DERIDED BY SOVIET PRESS—PROPAGANDA AND DECEPTION ALLEGED IN NEW ATTACKS

(By Max Frankel)

MOSCOW, July 29.—The Soviet press heaped scorn and disbelief today on the American National Exhibition here.

The exhibition is already physically surrounded in Sokolniki Park by displays of photographs and charts of Soviet achievements and efforts for the consumer. Today's press complaints characterized the U.S. show as nothing but propaganda, exaggeration, and attempted deception.

Virtually every newspaper here joined the chorus. Soviet commentators made an exception for the American automobiles, long admired by Russians in the streets of Moscow, and some spoke kindly of "The Family of Man" photographic exhibit.

But even "The Family of Man" did not suit some.

Sovetskaya Kultura published two of the several hundred photographs in the display without comment. They were of a young couple dancing a wild lindy and of customers indulging at a bar. Literaturnaya Gazeta, which was more specific, wondered whether the "wild ecstasies of rock 'n' roll convey some essential feature of the family of man."

Nothing but crowd-control problems, however, is inhibiting the flow of visitors, estimated today to total 65,000 to 70,000.

VISITORS VOICE COMPLAINTS

Americans studying the popular reaction found the Russian visitors, too, had a number of complaints.

One official, after interviewing many of the American guides dealing directly with the visitors, commented on two negative trends. He said a great number of the Russians complained of an absence of technical marvels at work before their eyes. Many others are apparently unhappy with the carnival-like confusion at the exhibition and would prefer an orderly passage. * * *

Most of the show today still was heavily coated with the dust churned up from the crumbling concrete floors. But even at its glittering best, the exhibition apparently had little to impress the official Soviet press. Newspapers here have been hitting hard at the show as well as at United States assertions of high living standards in general.

Today, as if on signal, the press fired another volley. Pravda, the Communist Party paper devoted half a page to expressions of disbelief that the average United States family earned $90 a week. But even with such an income, a writer calculated, a family could afford only one egg a person daily, only half a quart of milk, and only three telephone calls a week—made from a public phone because the family could not possibly have a private telephone.

MACHINE ACCUSED OF JOKING

Izvestia, Government newspaper, accused the exhibitoin's electronic question-answering machine of joking by glossing over the facts of unemployment in the United States. It devoted a long article to the plight of the evicted, debt-ridden and virtually starving jobless persons it said were roaming through the United States.

Sovetskaya Rossiya again assailed the model one-family home and the rest of what it described as the "myth of the average American." Komsomolskaya Pravada reported scornfully that its readers had seen the large G.U.M. department store in Moscow's Red Square and did not have to look at American bargain basements.

Several newspapers took delight in relating the entire show to the American art exhibition, which they ridiculed for its more extreme abstractions.

Literaturnaya Gazeta called the exhibition a "fantastic fairy tale world that has nothing to do with real life." It said the Russians had outgrown that age "long ago."

Today's commentary was by far the severest thus far on the exhibition, but apparently it signaled only a beginning. Literaturnaya Gazeta entitled its 2,000-word commentary "First Impressions" and said it was "too early as yet to give any overall estimate."

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 124) to extend the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1928) to provide for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2909. An act relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges; and

H.R. 6436. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act so as to include nematocides, plant regulators, defoliants, and dessicants, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4340) to amend sections 43 and 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 71, 62) to simplify the filing of referee vacancies.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 4413. An act to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6714. An act for the relief of Abraham Fye;

H.R. 6717. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kathrene LeTang; and

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8385) making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO RUSSIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hope the American public will not overlook some of the interesting developments in the Communist bloc of nations within the past few days. A pattern is showing among Red activities that coincides with Vice President NIXON's visit to Russia. Above all else, the Communists have inadvertently admitted that they are afraid—and this is especially significant because of what they fear.

The leaders of the Kremlin have long scoffed at our weapons, our industrial development, our productivity. Theirs is bigger and better, they tell us, or they are overtaking us. Or, as in the case of several inventions, they claim to have made the discoveries first.

What then do they fear?

The Communists fear our observance of Captive Nations Week. Khrushchev accused us of a plot to hold this observance at the time Mr. NIXON arrived in Russia. He said so publicly. Then so-called volunteers from the crowds in Moscow attempted to heckle Mr. NIXON. At county fairs, where I come from, such so-called volunteers are called "shills" since they are in the employ of the management. By their questions, these hecklers indicated that the Kremlin fears and resents our constant reminder to the people of the world that our Government does not recognize the forceful domination of sovereign people and that we have no intention of bartering away our support of the principle of freedom.

The Russians are concerned about the effect of our trade fair in Moscow. And therefore their press proceeds to explain it away, as untypical of American life. According to American correspondents' reports, the Moscow press today has begun an organized campaign of derogation against the American Trade Fair. The Soviet newspapers are attacking the fair on the grounds that Americans could not possibly have the high standard of living portrayed at the fair.

Pravda, the Communist party paper, devoted half a page to its disbelief that the average U.S. family has an income of $90 a week. Even with such an income, its writer calculated, an American family could afford only one egg per person each day, only half a quart of milk, and only three telephone calls each week—made from a pay telephone since such a family could not possibly have a private phone.

Some Americans who might wish that such restrictions could be put upon their teenage children, still should wonder what there is in telephones which should excite the worry of Communists.

The Russians are afraid of open cities. They do not permit visitors except for rare exceptions, to visit the Baltic States, southwest Russia, areas around Moscow, the Ural Mountains, industrial areas in western Siberia, border regions and large parts of central Asia, the far north, and the Soviet Far East. In retaliation—and only for that reason—the United States has closed many areas to Soviet travelers. Our "restricted areas" are open to all others.

One of the exceptions to foreign travel was made in the case of Vice President NIXON and his party. The Vice President told an audience at Novosibirsk yesterday:

I am sure that I speak for all of you when I say that this city and all cities here in the Soviet Union and in the United States should be opened so we could know each other better and build peace and friendship, which we all want.

Those are the Communist worries. They fear public reminders of their repressions. They fear the high standard of living of the free world. They fear full and free travel across the Iron Curtain. Above all, they fear freedom.

I am grateful that Vice President NIXON, by his presence and by his activities in the Soviet Union, has helped to illustrate and publicize these significant developments.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, editorials from several Pennsylvania newspapers which comment on the Vice President's trip and on other developments in Russia.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, July 18, 1959]

THE FEAR OF IDEAS

It was relaxing to have Messrs. Khrushchev and NIXON take time to assure the Russian and American peoples, as well as people everywhere that in their much publicized encounter before TV cameras they were just doing what comes naturally to both of them. Neither was offended; nothing to get scared about.

But to call the exchange a debate is to downgrade a noble institution. Premier Khrushchev made assertions that in a true debate would have been refuted in vivid fashion. When the Vice President, for instance, suggested that the Soviets should have no fears of ideas, the Premier countered with marked gusto that it was the Americans who were afraid of ideas, especially Communism.

At that very moment the agitation and propaganda department of the party was worrying itself sick about the ideas the U.S. exhibition was importing into Moscow, and it was going about as far as it dared go, without provoking an international scandal, to offset the exhibition's impact. Mr. Khrushchev himself helped along by seizing upon the Captive Nations theme to ridicule the Nixon visit time and again.

Muscovite interest in the exhibit is great; the Agitprop people knew it would be, and they proceeded to show everybody where the greatest fear of ideas really lies.

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

[From the Harrisburg Patriot, July 28, 1959]

RUSSIAN HORSE AHEAD OF CART

At least a couple of American working stiffs aren't too impressed with all the talk about the Russians leaving us behind in the scientific race.

John Petrocelli, a carpenter, and George Hartman, a painter, have been helping assemble the model ranchhouse at the American exhibition in Moscow's Sokolniki Park.

Said Petrocelli of the Russians: "They're 20 years behind the times. They don't even know what a labor union is. They thought I was a visitor from outer space."

Hartman voiced his surprise at the Soviet workers' unfamiliarity with tools American workmen consider commonplace.

When they tried to handle a stapling gun and a ratchet brace and bit, he said, the Russians were lost.

"We had them try to help us out," he added. "But the windup was that we had to end up doing it again ourselves. Electrical wiring, a job that would require two American electricians about 4 hours, took the Russians a solid 5 days."

This sort of thing, coupled with the spectacular achievements of Soviet science and industry suggests that the horses of Russian progress have left the cart with the masses far behind.

If all the conflicting reports on how Russia's doing leave Americans confused, how much more must the Russians be in the dark as to how Americans live?

It'll take a lot of cultural exchanges to enable each nation to get a balanced picture of the other.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, July 27, 1959]

SOVIET CENSORS

In a mockery of their professed approval of free exchange of ideas, the Russians have forced the removal of some 30 books from our exhibit in Moscow.

Included among them was that sensational, inflammatory volume which bears the title "The World Almanac, 1959."

Other titles, which are a guide to the prejudices of the Kremlin, are "Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People," "A United Nations Peace Force," "NATO—A 20th Century Community of Nations," "New History of the United States," "The Purity of Words," and "Faith and Freedom."

Come ot think of it, the Almanac is a subversive book by Communist standards, because it deals in facts, and mentions some unpleasant ones, such as the oppression of Hungary and the Soviet-inspired crisis on Berlin.

Let's keep this in our own almanac of facts for ready reference the next time the Russians turn on the propaganda faucet to show how anxious they are for two-way swap of culture, in which books are considerably more representative than a ballerina's pirouette.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, July 27, 1959]

THE SPIRIT OF MUNICH

Kind hearts and gentle people are to be found everywhere, but if British newspapers are in rapport with their readers, there is an unusually high concentration in the United Kingdom.

London press reaction to the tough language exchanged between Premier Khrushchev and Vice President NIXON was swift and strangely unanimous. London thought it simply frightful. Bad taste and all that sort of thing. "Back to secret diplomacy," urged the Daily Express, a newspaper owned by Lord Beaverbrook, who, on the eve of World War II, was denouncing Winston Churchill as "a busted flush" and a trouble-making alarmist.

Gentle people naturally do not like bickering, if that's what it was, or mutual threats. But when talking to a ruffian, as Mr. NIXON was, what is the other course? Knuckle under or stand there with your stiff upper lip quivering? That appears to be the British preference exemplified recently by Prime Minister Macmillan, and within memory at a place called Munich.

What the British call a "disgraceful performance" by Mr. NIXON will seem to some equally endangered but less scared Americans as the only manly course of action. Gentleness works with gentlemen. There are centuries of evidence of how well it works with bullies, a record on which the British ought to reflect whenever the tap of Prime Minister Chamberlain's umbrella can be heard echoing along Fleet Street.

MODEL AMERICAN HOME SHOWN AT MOSCOW EXHIBITION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Norman P. Mason, has sent me a very timely and interesting article illustrating the home which a typical U.S. worker can, and does, own. This is in answer to Mr. Khrushchev's doubts regarding the modest model home being shown at the Moscow Exhibition. Actually there is no doubt this exhibit is touching a sensitive spot in the Kremlin, namely, their housing picture as compared with our own.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of the article written by Ray Cromley, staff correspondent for Newspaper Enterprise Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE MAN MOSCOW SAID DIDN'T EXIST

(By Ray Cromley)

BALTIMORE.—Though he doesn't have the money, Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator Norman Mason would like to take a truckdriver named Brantley Hart to Moscow.

Object: To make Nikita Khrushchev eat crow.

And Brantley Hart is the man to do just that.

You see, there's an American national exposition opening in Moscow this summer. And on the grounds is a model house—one that could sell for $13,500. It's to be advertised as a typical American worker's home.

But the Russians—the officials who had a sneak preview—are pooh poohing the whole idea. Tass, the official Soviet news agency, which prints only thoughts authorized by Khrushchev and his aides, says the exhibition house is as typical of the typical American as the Taj Mahal is typical of Bombay textile workers or Buckingham Palace of British miners.

These statements aroused top U.S. Government housing man Mason. He asked his men to check the books and find just what homes typical American workers are buying. They came up with examples practically in Mason's own backyard.

Here's where truck driver Brantley Hart comes in. He lives in one of these houses. Brantley Hart, member of Teamster's Local 557, lives in a $13,500 house in Country Club Estates, just outside of Baltimore. He pays $86 monthly payments out of his $123.40-a-week salary for a five-room house that's a close equivalent of the American show house in the Moscow exhibition. The cost is roughly the same. So is the size—950 square feet. Also the general floor plan. Brantley Hart obviously is a typical American worker, with a wife, two children—and a new car in the carport.

Hart drives a truck on the midnight shift from Baltimore, 100 miles down the road to Salisbury, Md., and back every night, 40 hours a week.

Brantley Hart's case is typical. Country Club Estates is filled with American workmen. There's Clif Bowen, for example, a neon sign mechanic, member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 28. Clif earns $114 a week, pays $96 a month on a $13,500 house and lot with 1 tree, 10 bushes, and a sodded front lawn. He has two boys, one girl, and a wife.

Administrator Mason's statistic researchers found the average American workman these days buys, on the average, a $14,207 home and pays for it out of his $6,092 to $6,803 average salary, making average $96 monthly payments.

Why then do the Russians find this Moscow exhibit house hard to understand? The Federal Housing Administration has some figures on this, too.

It seems the average Russian city dweller—if he can afford a new house—ends up with two rooms and a bath, and shares it with another family.

In Moscow, a house like the Brantley Harts' would have 13 to 14 people living in it, instead of the 4 at the Harts' or the 5 at the Bowens'.

Some of Mason's men think this is why Nikita Khrushchev can't believe the American house in the Moscow exposition is typical.

They think this is why Tass and Russian officials jeer at the idea of a typical American workman coming home to a large television set, running water in the kitchen, wall-to-wall carpeting, radios, and record players—the things most Americans take for granted.

CIVIL DEFENSE—CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP TO DISASTER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on another subject I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 5 minutes notwithstanding the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. The subject is civil defense, to which I shall address myself from time to time as we conclude this session.

The subject of civil defense is perceptibly before us right now through speeches and articles by our colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who is devoting a good deal of his attention to this specific issue—generally disapproving of our civil defense preparations—and by the fact that presently there is in conference the matter of appropriations for the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. A difference exists between the House and Senate in conference, involving the restoration of $15 million to provide the full budget estimate of $25 million for Federal contributions on a matching basis, which is an outward manifestation of our whole attitude toward this subject. For this reason I intend to speak rather briefly today, and later in full detail, in the hope that such discussion will assist in securing improvement. I believe it would be well to start today on preparations right here at home, in the Capitol itself.

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6

The particular branch of the subject to which I wish to address myself today is: What is the Congress itself doing about civil defense? Civil defense is getting to be a topic much like the weather—everyone talks about it but no one does much about it. As we increase our military defense preparations, as we state the ways in which we can agree to ease tensions and reaffirm the determination of our people to stand up to the Communist threat, we seem to progress from chipping away to hacking away at our nonmilitary defense.

The apathy toward civil defense which we think of as being indicative of the attitude of the general public—and an apathy about which I have my doubts—may well be, I believe, a reflection of apathy in the Congress. For example, how many Members know what is the bell signal for a civil defense drill or an actual disaster? How many of us are just as well satisfied that the Congress has never been subjected to the "discomfiture" of an air raid test drill as have been entire communities and the executive departments of the Government? Is exempting ourselves from civil defense exercises the leadership in saving their very lives which we offer to the American people? Do we exempt ourselves from shipboard boat drills or transocean plane ditching drills?

Mr. President, we may not be very important here, but the people of the United States think that we have a good deal to do with running the country. So it seems to me that if we cannot be fully consistent about our own civil defense, we are hardly likely to be fully consistent about the need for it in the country at large.

In the much-discussed New Senate Office Building there are no "S"-marked arrows pointing the way toward shelter areas. In addition, as far as I can discover, there are no shelter plans for the Capitol Hill area, nor has anyone demanded such plans—although there has been much talk in general terms about a shelter program.

How many of us have made any civil defense preparations for our own families? How many of us make inquiry regarding Federal buildings and facilities being planned and constructed in our own States as to civil defense facilities? And are State government buildings in the same situation?

In nonmilitary defense is important, as it is, without doubt, how can we give any leadership to the country with the knowledge that the Architect of the Capitol, to whom is entrusted the responsibility of our own personal civil defense, has as far as I know, no civil defense equipment? While our concern with radiation and fallout hazards has produced numerous studies and reports, Congress is not equipped with any device for the detection of such radiation should we be subject to the danger of radioactive fallout.

Mr. President, we are all quite well conditioned to protection against barrages of the written and spoken word, but what if a more substantial weapon is launched against our Nation? Our files are bulging with material, pro and con, on civil defense. But we seemingly do nothing—and seemingly care little.

Mr. President, as to testimony on this subject, it is more than ample. It was pointed out in the recent report on civil defense by the House Committee on Government Operations:

> From the enemy's standpoint, a strong civil defense in the United States would mean first of all that our strategic strike forces will be used if necessary, despite the consequences of a return blow by the enemy. It would mean our stern warnings that aggression will be resisted are no idle threats. A strong civil defense in the United States also would mean that a successful strike against the United States would require a much greater effort on the part of the enemy. That is, it would cost the enemy a great deal more to achieve any given level of destruction. This factor could be extremely important over a long period of time in preventing the Soviet Union from building up a decisive margin of power.

The Rand Corp. "Report on a Study of Nonmilitary Defense" stresses the point that nonmilitary, civil defense measures might make two significant contributions to the national defense:

> First, they might alleviate the catastrophe of nuclear attack and, if military victory were attained, provide a reasonable chance that the United States as a nation could survive, even in an atomic war. Second, they might increase U.S. freedom of action in conducting peacetime foreign policy and in implementing a broad deterrence strategy.

The Special Studies Report II of the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, "International Security: The Military Aspect," warns:

> If relations with the Soviet bloc ever reach the showdown stage, the edge of difference, which may be very fine, may well depend on the strength of the competing wills. This in turn is likely to reflect the relative vulnerabilities. * * * An enemy who felt confident that he could disrupt and disorganize our society while preserving the substance of his own might be tempted to launch an all-out blow. Conversely the ability to afford reasonable protection to our population may enable us to act with firmness and resolution in time of crisis. In the age of the ballistic missile the known capability of a society to withstand attack will become an increasingly important deterrent.

Apparently these warnings are being filed by the Congress, either as material for further studies, or to be used during a future political campaign. In any event, no one denies their substance—nor does there seem to be any great will to act on them.

Mr. President, I speak not in criticism of any colleague or any agency. Indeed, I think we all should be very grateful to our colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who, when he first became a Member of the Senate, went to work on the civil defense subject, and although many disagreements may develop, or have developed, between him and myself as to the details of a civil defense program, I am all with him about the fact that if we are to have such a program, we have to take it very seriously; and that is what I am attempting to do.

However, I do urge that we give personal—and I emphasize, personal—consideration to the protection of millions of the innocent and defenseless whose lives would be endangered in the event of conflict. We spend about 32 cents per capita for civil defense; the British spend 72 cents and the Germans spend 50 cents. The British and the Germans learned bitter lessons during World War II as to the meaning, in terms of blood and national substance, of nonmilitary defense.

The Russians have special problems, and, incidentally, they have an extremely disciplined operation in their country and they are taking other measures which they think suit them. I will discuss that question on another occasion, but our problem is our own and cannot be handled that way.

Finally, Mr. President, if due to our own lack of real concern here—as manifested to the Nation by our own unpreparedness in civil defense—we should suffer the consequences and the Nation be leaderless, it would of course be a personal disaster to each of us, but infinitely more serious through our own shortsightedness here there may be no Nation to lead.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, let me at the outset express my deference and devotion to the distinguished senior Senator from New York. It is a fact that he and I served together as colleagues in the other body, and that we have been good friends through the years. I hold him in the highest admiration.

There is obviously a marked difference of opinion between him and me on the subject of civil defense.

I may say further, in speaking of my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from New York State, that it happens I admire also his fine record in the Armed Forces of our country in time of war. From his experience there, and from his study of the history of our Nation, he of course knows that in time of great emergency, in wartime, the Armed Forces of our country will instantly take over, and no civilian with an arm band will be permitted to interfere with the military.

The Senator from New York knows, as we all do who have studied the history of our country, that in the Civil War, terrible as it was at that time, but which would be now considered a limited war, President Abraham Lincoln immediately assumed the powers of a dictator. He suspended the writ of habeas corpus, and throughout the duration of that conflict he remained a virtual dictator.

Mr. President, the editor of the Columbus Citizen, one of Ohio's great newspapers, a member of the Scripps-Howard chain, wrote me a letter which I received today saying:

> DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: You're on the right track. Civil defense as it is is just a boondoggle.

In the city of Cleveland, from which the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] comes, and where he and I both live, on Monday of this week as on every Monday, there was sounded a long blast on the sirens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110046-6